JEFFERSON COUNTY ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

Dale Weis, Chair; Janet Sayre Hoeft, Vice-Chair; Aari Roberts, Secretary

<u>PUBLIC HEARING</u> BEGINS AT **1:00 P.M.** ON MARCH 14, 2019 IN ROOM 205, JEFFERSON COUNTY COURTHOUSE

<u>CALL TO ORDER FOR BOARD MEMBERS ONLY</u> IS AT 10:30 A.M. IN COURTHOUSE ROOM 203, PRIOR TO THE HEARING

<u>SITE INSPECTION FOR BOARD MEMBERS ONLY</u> LEAVES AT 10:40 A.M. FROM COURTHOUSE ROOM 203, PRIOR TO THE HEARING

1. Call to Order-Room 203 at 10:30 a.m.

Meeting called to order @ 10:30 a.m. by Weis

2. Roll Call (Establish a Quorum)

Members present: Weis, Roberts, Hoeft

Members absent: -----

Staff: Matt Zangl, Sarah Higgins, Lindsey Schreiner, Laurie Miller

Weis noted the newly appointed alternates, Dan Jaeckel and LaVerne Beherens, were present.

3. Certification of Compliance with Open Meetings Law

Hoeft acknowledged publication. Staff also presented proof of publication.

4. Approval of the Agenda

Roberts made motion to approve. Hoeft made motion requesting a modification to hear the Lemke petition first. Motion was seconded by Roberts, motion carried 3-0 on a voice vote to approve the agenda with the change.

5. Approval of January 10, 2019 Meeting Minutes

Hoeft made motion, seconded by Roberts, motion carried 3-0 on a voice vote to approve the agenda.

- **6. Communications** There was a brief discussion on future trainings.
- 7. Public Comment None

8. Site Inspections – Beginning at 10:40 a.m. and Leaving from Room 203

V1641-19 - Richard & Bonnie Barnhart, Town of Lake Mills

V1642-19 – Doral Richardson, Town of Lake Mills

V1643-19 – Nancy May Bishell, Town of Oakland

V1640-19 - Michael Martorano/Mortarono Trust Property, Town of Koshkonong

V1638-19 – John A Lemke Sr/N&M Lemke Trust Property, Town of Koshkonong

9. Public Hearing – Beginning at 1:00 p.m. in Room 205

Meeting called to order @ 1:00 p.m. by Weis

Members present: Weis, Roberts, Hoeft

Members absent: ---

Staff: Matt Zangl, Laurie Miller, Sarah Higgins, Lindsey Schriener

10. Explanation of Process by Board of Adjustment Chair

The following was read into the record by Roberts:

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING JEFFERSON COUNTY ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Jefferson County Zoning Board of Adjustment will conduct a public hearing at 1:00 p.m. on Thursday, March 14, 2019 in Room 205 of the Jefferson County Courthouse, Jefferson, Wisconsin. Matters to be heard are applications for variance from terms of the Jefferson County Zoning Ordinance. No variance may be granted which would have the effect of allowing in any district a use not permitted in that district. No variance may be granted which would have the effect of allowing a use of land or property which would violate state laws or administrative rules. Subject to the above limitations, variances may be granted where strict enforcement of the terms of the ordinance results in an unnecessary hardship and where a variance in the standards will allow the spirit of the ordinance to be observed, substantial justice to be accomplished and the public interest not violated. Based upon the findings of fact, the Board of Adjustment must conclude that: 1) Unnecessary hardship is present in that a literal enforcement of the terms of the ordinance would unreasonably prevent the owner from using the property for a permitted purpose or would render conformity with such restrictions unnecessarily burdensome; 2) The hardship is due to unique physical limitations of the property rather than circumstances of the applicant; 3) The variance will not be contrary to the public interest as expressed by the purpose and intent of the zoning ordinance. **PETITIONERS, OR THEIR REPRESENTATIVES, SHALL BE PRESENT.** There may be site inspections prior to public hearing which any interested parties may attend; discussion and possible action may occur after public hearing on the following:

(NOTE: The Lemke petition was moved to be heard first)

<u>V1638-19 – John A Lemke Sr/N&M Lemke Trust Property:</u> Variance from Sec. 11.03(d)1 of the Jefferson County Zoning Ordinance to allow creation of a 2.8-acre building site using an existing private right-of-way to State Road 106. The site in the Town of Koshkonong on PIN 016-0614-3633-003 (12.665 Ac), near **W5273 State Road 106**, and is zoned Residential R-2.

John Lemke, 6646 W Woodridge Drive, Janesville, presented the petition. He approached the map and explained the petition. He stated that they went back to the town to modify the lot. They found out that Hebbe owned part of the ROW at the very beginning. They have met with all the property owners accessing the private drive, and he explained what they all wanted before they all signed the agreement. They wanted to get it blacktopped, and were going to set it up as shares. He showed the Board all that was owned. Stiemke wanted to buy additional lands, but it would create a landlocked piece. He showed other ways to access the property. Hebbe owns a portion of the ROW, but wants additional land added to the back of his lot. He noted that there should be a copy of the tentative easement agreement in the file. Mr. Lemke read an email from Attorney Jim Vance regarding the easement.

Roberts asked about the change in the area being split off. The petitioner stated they would be splitting off mom's house and they would be buying the balance. Weis asked the petitioner if he would be OK with having a final signed easement agreement as a condition, if approved. The petitioner said he would. Weis explained the ordinance requirements that every property has to have 66' frontage and access to a public road. He noted the houses have been there for a long time, but there has been no recorded agreement for the use of the driveway. It was previously tabled for the easement agreement and a lot reconfiguration. Regarding the remnant parcel that could be built on, Weis suggested there may be a condition that if there were any more houses or lots being proposed, they would have to have it converted to a public road.

The petitioner explained the reason they wanted to do it this way was so he could be close by to take care of his mom. Roberts asked for clarification of the lot and access to the farmland. The petitioner stated they would access through their own land. Zangl further explained. Weis noted that Kutz farmed all the land all around. Roberts noted that he wanted to make sure the ag lands were not landlocked. Zangl noted that there have been restrictions for ag equipment access, but not an all vehicle restriction access.

There were no questions or comments in favor or opposition of the petition. Zangl noted they did go back to the town, but we did not get the newer decision from the town. There was the original town response in the file of approval read into the record by Weis. The petitioner noted that they did go back to the town, and they are aware of the changes that were made.

Zangl gave staff report. He noted there was a revised preliminary and easement agreement in the file. There were some recent changes, so not all of the property owners have signed yet. Mrs. Lemke asked how long they had to get the agreement. Zangl stated there was no time limit unless the Board decides otherwise. Mrs. Lemke stated that she believed that everyone was in agreement. Weis commented that there were questions on how the access was being used and have come a

long way to resolve that. The petitioner noted that a drainage ditch/tile was also included in the agreement to solve drainage problems.

<u>V1640-19 – Michael Martorano/Martorano Trust Property:</u> Variance from Sec. 11.04(f)2 and 11.07(d) of the Jefferson County Zoning Ordinance to allow a home addition at less than the required road setbacks, and on a property previously granted variance with V1350-10, in 2010. The site is at **W7618 Koshkonong Mounds Rd,** Town of Koshkonong, in a Residential R-2 zone on PIN 016-0513-2433-002 (0.58 Ac).

Pete Weston, Design Alliance Architects (1030 Madison Avenue), presented the petition. Michael Mortorano (W7618 Koshkonong Mounds Road), was also present. Mr. Weston explained that both owners were disabled, so they were trying to get a master bedroom on the main floor. There is an existing porch on the front of the house that they are proposing to in-fill. There is an existing porch, stoop and steps in the front that will not be any closer to the road than the existing steps already are. He had drawings and approached the Board to explain. They will be filling in where the porch currently is and will have steps with an entry stoop. Weis noted the front roofline would virtually remain the same. The petitioner stated that would be right. Mr. Weston also showed that they will be adding a small decorative roof with pillars.

Hoeft ask if there were any other options. Mr. Weston stated it was steep to the lake, and there is the location of the septic and well. Doing it differently would increase the footprint of the house and would stretch beyond the limits. Hoeft commented on not taking personal circumstances into consideration. Mr. Weston noted it would become a substantially bigger project if done differently.

Roberts asked about the roofline being moved out. Mr. Weston explained that it would be the same footprint as the corner of the deck. There was further discussion on the roofline. Weston explained that it would not be any closer than the existing. Roberts asked about the handicap access and why this does not address any of that. Mr. Weston stated they will have a lot of room in the back when they need to. They will need to bring it to grade and further explained. There was further discussion on what was being proposed. Hoeft noted that it was OK now, but as some point they would need to be able to have ramp access. Mr. Weston explained. Roberts ask why they shouldn't address the handicap access now with this project. Mr. Weston explained. Mr. Mortorano stated that it could probably be put inside, not on the outside because they enter through a back mudroom. There was further discussion on the handicap access.

There were no questions or comments in favor or opposition of the petition. There was a town response in the file approving the petition which was read into the record by Weis.

Roberts questioned the location of the well. Mr. Mortorano stated it was in the back and the mound was to the west.

Zangl gave staff report. He noted the plan submitted by the petitioner was the same as what was in the file. This is an existing, non-conforming structure. The house was built a long time ago, and there are no permits on file. It is a shoreland property with steep slopes to the north. There have

been a couple other previous variances. This is a small addition/remodel to the front of the house. It's 5' from the lot line, but does not meet the road setbacks.

Hoeft asked staff about ordinance Section 11.07(d) for setbacks. Zangl explained that is for the road setbacks, and the R-2 zone setback is referenced in Section 11.04(f). Roberts asked what the setbacks were for this project. Zangl stated it would be 6.2' to the foundation and 5' from the roofline. This project itself is closer to 7' where the entrance is.

<u>V1641-19 – Richard & Bonnie Barnhart:</u> Variance from Sec. 11.04(f)1 of the Jefferson County Zoning Ordinance to allow an addition to the home at **N6840 Shorewood Hills Road** at less than the required side yard setback. The site is on PIN 018-0713-1011-010 (0.55 Ac) in the Town of Lake Mills and is zoned Residential R-1. It had previously been granted a variance, V253-86, in 1986.

Rick Barnhart, N6840 Shorewood Hills Rd., presented his petition. They want to add onto the house because the garage is not useful. In 1986, there was a variance to reduce the setback for a screened porch and deck. This is a very narrow lot at 58' in front and 65' in the back. The project is to add a 3-car garage with an entryway that's more useable.

Roberts asked the petitioner to approach the table with his plans and explain. The petitioner showed the Board the site plan and explained his project. Roberts asked if a 2-car garage with a handicap access along the side of it would meet the setbacks. The petitioner explained.

Zangl explained that this was a unique situation. They are not coming any closer to the setback, and we could most likely permit this without coming in front of the Board, but they are here because there was a previous variance in 1986. The setbacks being proposed are being met well within the setbacks. Roberts asked Zangl for clarification and Zangl explained. The petitioner stated they are taking off the old deck, replacing it and putting a screened porch under it.

There were no questions or comments in favor or opposition of the petition. There was a town response in the file approving the petition which was read into the record by Weis.

Staff report was given by Zangl. He stated that the existing deck is at 5.6' and at its closest corner, it would be 4.2'. They are proposing 11'off one corner and 8.5' from the other. They are well within the setbacks – they are just making it bigger. Zangl asked the petitioner how far off the front property line they would be. The petitioner stated about 100'.

<u>V1642-19 – Doral Richardson:</u> Variance from Sec. 11.04(f)6 and 11.07(d) of the Jefferson County Zoning Ordinance to allow an accessory structure at less than the required right-of-way setback at **W8511 Airport Rd.** The site is on PIN 018-0713-0414-001 (2.25 Ac) in the Town of Lake Mills, and is zoned A-1, Agricultural.

Doral Richardson, W8511 Airport, explained his petition. He stated he wants a 24'x36' structure off the side of the other building and explained the location. It would be more than 50' from the

property line. The power comes through on the south side of the property, there's the septic and the old & new well location. This seems to be the best spot.

Weis asked if the use was for general storage. The petitioner stated that it was a workshop. Weis asked if it had the same roofline. The petitioner stated it would be the same. Hoeft asked who owned the property to the north. The petitioner stated it was owned by the state/town. Roberts asked if they have approached the town for dedication. The petitioner stated that he has had discussions with the town, and he said he needed to get this done first. Shifting that property line could take months. Hoeft stated he had a lot of land. The petitioner stated he like the open yard. Roberts questioned the other structures. The petitioner explained the older buildings. Weis commented on possible other buried foundations. Robert asked about placing it in the northwest corner meeting the setbacks. The petitioner stated there would be problems with the approach due to the slope, with a lot of other buildings and quarry that used to be there. Roberts commented they could do some grading. The petitioner said it would then become cost prohibitive. Weis noted the width of ROW. Roberts commented the ROW could be vacated.

Hoeft stated she was looking at all the empty land. It's what he wants to do rather than needs to do. There are alternatives. The petitioner stated there are probably alternatives, but are not the best. There was further discussion on placement. Roberts suggested he place it by the milk house. The petitioner stated there was a problem with the slope, and he would have to tear out all that was there and start over. There was plumbing in there and there is currently power into there. All that would have to be redone and changed.

There were no questions or comments in favor or opposition of the petition. There was a town response in the file approving the petition which was read into the record by Weis.

Staff report was given by Zangl. He stated the property was zoned A-1. The setbacks would be 50' from the ROW and 85' to the centerline. The location he is proposing the structure, meets the 85' from the centerline. However, the ROW is abnormally located. The proposed structure does not meet the 50' to the ROW. The road was relocated for some reason. At that time, the ROW was never dedicated or changed. If there was dedication, it would meet the setbacks or appears it would meet the setbacks. The petitioner explained the location of the septic and drain field, and the wells.

Weis asked if he was proposing it to be physically connected. The petitioner stated it is not. Zangl noted that if he added to the existing, he would still have to go through the process. The petitioner stated it would 8' away from the other building. Roberts asked if he would be open to adding on. The petitioner stated he was told that wouldn't work either. Zangl explained that if he wanted to add on, it would have limitations of less than 50% of the footprint expansion and less than 50% of structural members, so he would still need the variance.

<u>V1643-19 – Nancy Bishell:</u> Variance from Sec. 11.04(f)1 of the Jefferson County Zoning Ordinance to allow new lot creation at less than the minimum lot area, and resulting in a garage at less than the required side/rear yard setback. The site is at **W9304 & W9308 Oakland Rd,** on

PINs 022-0613-0533-012 (0.158 Ac), 022-0613-0533-013 (0.287 Ac) and 022-0613-0533-022, all in the Town of Oakland. The properties are zoned Residential R-1.

Attorney Michael Rumpf presented the petition. He stated that the map and narrative has already been submitted. The town has approved the petition. The Bishell's have owned the lots for a significant time with some lands being vacated by the town. He submitted the survey and explained the land split with one lot not meeting the total lot square footage as well as not meeting the setbacks between the garages.

Roberts questioned the setbacks. Zangl stated 3' would be required for a detached accessory structure. Weis asked if the measurements were from the roofline. Attorney Rumpf stated he did not know, that the surveyor did it, but suspected it was from the roofline. Roberts asked about the lot square footage. Attorney Rumpf stated 19,540 square feet. He explained that they cannot acquire any more land. Hoeft asked if he was asking to create a non-conforming lot. The petitioner further explained the 2 lots. Roberts stated it was 3 lots now which are substandard. They could take the garages down and put a house in the middle. The petitioner stated the two houses were on the north and south with the garages in the middle. They are just trying to clean this up. Weis commented this would be a better compromise. Hoeft questioned the garages. Weis showed her the map found in the file.

There were no questions or comments in favor or opposition of the petition. There was a town response in the file from the town approving the petition which was read into the record by Weis.

Zangl gave staff report. He stated that this is as close as they can get. Two lots are substandard. The sheds don't meet the setbacks by .2'.

There was a break @ 2:30 – reconvened at 2:35.

11. Discussion and Possible Action on Above Petitions (see following pages & files)

12. Adjourn

Hoeft made motion, seconded by Weis, motion carried 3-0on a voice vote to adjourn @ 3:45 p.m.

If you have questions regarding these variances, please contact the Zoning Department at 920-674-7113 or 920-674-8638. Variance files referenced on this hearing notice may be viewed in Courthouse Room 201 between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. Monday through Friday, excluding holidays. Materials covering other agenda items can be found at www.jeffersoncountywi.gov.

JEFFFERSON COUNTY ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

A quorum of any Jefferson County Committee, Board, Commission or other body, including the Jefferson County Board of Supervisors, may be present at this meeting.

County Administrator at 920-674-7101 at least 24 hour arrangements can be made.	rs prior to the meeting so appropriate
A digital recording of the meeting will be available in the Additional information on Zoning can be found at www.	
Secretary	Date

Individuals requiring special accommodations for attendance at the meeting should contact the

DECISION OF THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT JEFFERSON COUNTY, WISCONSIN

PETITION NO.:	2019 V1638 1-10-2019 & 3-14-2019
APPLICANT:	John A Lemke Sr
PROPERTY OWNER:	N & Lemke Trust c/o Mildred Lemke
PARCEL (PIN) #:	016-0614-3633-003 (State Road 106)
TOWNSHIP:	Koshkonong
INTENT OF PETITION access to a public road	ER: To allow for a 3.2-acre R-2 zoned building site without frontage and
THE FEATURES OF TH THE GRANT OR DENIA -Rezoned to R-2 in -Petitioners would l approved and signe- ordinance requirem -Property is a larger -4 homes currently of -11.03(d)- All lots sh least 66 feet.	E PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION AND PROPERTY WHICH RELATE TO AL OF THE VARIANCE APPLICATION ARE: 1975 (R131A) ike to build another home/create a lot-would only need a CSM d off by the Town and Zoning Director if it meets all ents. than normal for an R-2 zone (12.67-acres) exist on the private drive located off State Road 106 all front on and have access to a Public Road for a minimum distance of at
	ill have frontage and access to the private road that is owned by public. Access would be an easement onto the private road.
-Town approved wit	th condition 11-14-18 (see file for condition)
	ONS BASED ON SITE INSPECTIONS: Site inspections ed property layout & location.
FACTS PRESENTED AT	PUBLIC HEARING: See tape, minutes & file.

·-			CHAI	RPERSON						
SIGNI	E D :					D	ATE:	03-14-	2019	
				signatures to b Any other pro						py on file with
MOTI	ON:	Hoeft		SECOND:	Weis		VO'	TE: 3-0	(voice voi	te)
DECIS	SION: '	THE REQU	ESTED VA	RIANCE IS G	RANTED	•				
A VA	RIANC	E MAY BE (GRANTED	IF ALL THES	SE COND	TIONS AF	RE MET			
			•	st interest beca		•		or numerou	<u>is propertie</u>	S.
	<u>clarifi</u>	ed situation a	and makes a	F THE ZONII	ff of 106. I	<u>t's smoothe</u>	d things o	ver for cur		re property
3.				BE CONTR						
				d. There is one						me area was
	drivev	vays built, ho	mes constru	icted & land d The R-2 desi	ivisions wi	thout any p	ublic road	or agreem	ents which	was before
2.				EASONABLE N THE CIRCU						
		access. This		es. They need	to nave acc	cess on the	iane now a	x in the fu	ture. I nere	s is no proper,
	REAS	ONABLE U	SE OF THI	E PROPERTY	(USE VAI	RIANCE) E	BECAUSE	witho	ut the variar	nce, they have
				SARILY BUR NANCE WOU						
				E <mark>WOULD</mark> UN TED PURPO						
1.	UNN	ECESSARY	HARDSHII	P <mark>IS</mark> PRESEN	Γ IN THA	T A LITER	AL ENFO	ORCEME	NT OF TH	E TERMS OF
	BASE	D ON THE	FINDINGS	S OF FACT, T	HE BOAR	D CONCL	UDES TH	IAT:		
				NANCE TO I E PUBLIC IN				AL JUSTIC	EE TO BE	
	NO R	EASONABL	E USE OF	ZONING OR THE PROPE	RTY IN T	HE ABSEN	ICE OF A	VARIAN	CE AND W	
С.				LIMITATION						
		IC INTERE			IMITIAL,	OSTICE I	O BE AC	COMITEIS	AILD, AINI	JIIIE
	ORDI	NANCE UN	NECESSA	RILY BURDE RVED, SUBST	ENSOME,	AND WILI	L ALLOW	THE SPI	RIT OF TH	ΙE
				NABLY PRE OSE, OR WOU						
В.				LIMITATION ZONING OR						
Α.				CH WOULD						
A.	NO V	ADIANCE	AAV RE CD	ANTED WHI	ICH WOIT	ID HAVE	TUE EEE	ECT OF	ATTOWING	CAUSE OF

BOARD DECISIONS MAY BE APPEALED TO CIRCUIT COURT. AUDIO RECORD OF THESE PROCEEDINGS IS AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST.

PETITION NO.:	2019 V1640
HEARING DATE:	03-14-2019
APPLICANT:	Michael Martorano
PROPERTY OWNER:	Martorano Trust
PARCEL (PIN) #:	016-0513-2433-002 (W7618 Koshkonong Mounds Rd)
TOWNSHIP:	Koshkonong
	ER: To allow for the addition to a home with a previously granted Variance for at W7618 Koshkonong Mounds Rd, PIN 016-0513-2433-002.
THE APPLICANT REQUIEFFERSON COUNTY 2	ESTS A VARIANCE FROM SECTION <u>11.04(f)(2) & 11.07(d)</u> OF THE CONING ORDINANCE.
THE FEATURES OF TH	E PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION AND PROPERTY WHICH RELATE TO
	L OF THE VARIANCE APPLICATION ARE:
-Existing non-conf	orming structure; house built prior to issuance of permits
	with greater than 20% slopes on majority of property
	e minimum lot depth of that 50ft by 207ft strip of land
	minimum lot area in the division (denied)
	nd grading/landscaping
	or grading, filling, and construction of retaining wall and sheds without permits
	90 issued in 2018 for replacement system
	ke overhang to existing gable roof (asking for 5' from front lot line) - Sections
	d) of Jefferson County Zoning Ordinance requires 30' from road right-of-way
and 63' from center	, ,
	ONS BASED ON SITE INSPECTIONS: Site inspections ed property layout & location.
FACTS PRESENTED AT	PUBLIC HEARING: See tape, minutes & file.

DECIS MOTI MOTI CONI		SECOND: SECOND: L: As proposed by the	Weis (Moti Hoeft	on Withdrawn) VOTE: 2-1	(voice vote) 03-14-2019	
DECIS MOTI	ON: Roberts	SECOND:	Weis (Moti	,	(voice vote)	
	SION: THE REQUEST	ED VARIANCE IS GR	ANTED.			
*A VA						
	RIANCE MAY BE GRA	NTED IF ALL THESE	E CONDITIO	NS ARE MET*		
6.		L/WILL NOT BE CO INTENT OF THE ZO afety. There would be n	ONING ORD	INANCE BECA	USE the add	ition will not in
	PROPERTY RATHER features of the property	R THAN THE CIRCUM does not allow many of st or all neighbors are ed	MSTANCES (ptions. The b	OF THE APPLIC ack has a steep d	CANT BECAUSErop-off to the lake, t	the physical he road is where
5.	THE HARDSHIP OR	oposed because there ar NO REASONABLE U			•	
		t out of compliance. Th				
	RESTRICTIONS UNI	NECESSARILY BURD ORDINANCE WOUL OF THE PROPERTY (ENSOME (A LD LEAVE TI	REA VARIANCI HE PROPERTY	E) OR STRICT CO OWNER WITH N	MPLIANCE O
4.		RDSHIP <mark>IS</mark> PRESENT NANCE <mark>WOULD</mark> UNI ERMITTED PURPOSI	REASONABL	Y PREVENT TI	HE OWNER FROM	I USING THE
		DINGS OF FACT, TH			AT:	
С.	COMPLIANCE WITH NO REASONABLE U THE SPIRIT OF THE	BOVE LIMITATIONS I THE ZONING ORD SE OF THE PROPER E ORDINANCE TO BE ND THE PUBLIC INT	INANCE WC TY IN THE A E OBSERVEI	OULD LEAVE TI ABSENCE OF A D, SUBSTANTIA	HE PROPERTY OV VARIANCE AND V	WNER WITH WILL ALLOW
	FOR A PERMITTED ORDINANCE UNNE	REASONABLY PREVI PURPOSE, OR WOUL CESSARILY BURDEN OBSERVED, SUBSTANOT VIOLATED.	D RENDER ISOME, AND	CONFORMITY WILL ALLOW	WITH THE ZONI THE SPIRIT OF T	NG HE
В.	COMPLIANCE WITH	BOVE LIMITATIONS	INANCE RE	SULTS IN AN U	NNECESSARY HA	ARDSHIP
	En de en i kei en i			IE LAWS OR AI	DMINISTRATIVE	RULES:
Α.		BE GRANTED WHIC Y WHICH WOULD VI				

BOARD DECISIONS MAY BE APPEALED TO CIRCUIT COURT. AUDIO RECORD OF THESE PROCEEDINGS IS AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST.

DECISION OF THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT JEFFERSON COUNTY, WISCONSIN

PETITION NO.:	2019 V1641
HEARING DATE:	03-14-2019
APPLICANT:	Richard M & Bonnie M Barnhart
PROPERTY OWNER:	SAME
PARCEL (PIN) #:	018-0713-1011-010 (N6840 Shorewood Hills Rd)
TOWNSHIP:	Lake Mills
	Ter:To construct an addition to a home with a previously granted variance Rd, PIN 018-0713-1011-010.
THE APPLICANT REQU JEFFERSON COUNTY 2	UESTS A VARIANCE FROM SECTION11.04(f)(1) OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE.
THE GRANT OR DENIA	IE PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION AND PROPERTY WHICH RELATE TO AL OF THE VARIANCE APPLICATION ARE: setback - Section 11.04(f)(1) of the Jefferson County Zoning Ordinance requires
	slope on majority of property
	ced R-1 side setback to construct screened porch addition to single family
residence	
	ht-of-way and center of road?
	Iditions will not go any closer to the property line
-Proposed addition	s include garage, new entrance, screen room addition
	ONS BASED ON SITE INSPECTIONS: Site inspections
conducted. Observ	ved property layout & location.
FACTS PRESENTED AT	PUBLIC HEARING: See tape, minutes & file.
	• •

A.			E MAY B OPERTY											A USE OF LES:
B.	COM WHI FOR ORD ORD	IPLIANC CH WOU A PERM INANCE INANCE	THE ABO E WITH T LD UNRE ITTED PU UNNECI TO BE O EREST NO	'HE ZO EASONA JRPOSE ESSARII BSERVI	NING O ABLY PR C, OR WO LY BURI ED, SUB	RDIN EVEN DULD DENS	NANCE NT THE REND SOME, A	RESU E PETI ER CC ND W	LTS IN TIONE NFOR TLL AL	AN UNER FROMITY V	NNECH OM USI WITH T THE SP	ESSAR NG TI THE Z TRIT (Y HARI HE PRO ONINO OF THE	OSHIP OPERTY G
С.	COM NO I THE ACCO	IPLIANC REASONA SPIRIT (OMPLISE		THE ZO E OF TH ORDINA O THE P	NING O IE PROF NCE TO PUBLIC I	RDIN PERTY DBE (INTE	NANCE Y IN TH OBSERV REST N	WOUI IE ABS VED, S IOT VI	LD LEA SENCE SUBSTA IOLATI	VE TH OF A V NTIAL ED.	E PRO ARIAN JUSTI	PERT	Y OWN ND WII	STRICT IER WITH LL ALLOW
7.	UNN THE PRO REST WITH REAS	JECESSA ZONING PERTY F TRICTIO H THE Z SONABL ctional ga	RY HARD G ORDINA OR A PER NS UNNE ONING O E USE OF	SHIP IS ANCE W RMITTE CCESSAI PRDINA THE PI being ab	PRESE OULD DURF CD PURF RILY BU NCE WO	NT IN UNRI POSE URDE DULD TY (U	N THAT EASONA OR WO NSOME LEAVI SE VAR	' A LIT ABLY I ULD F (ARE E THE IANCI	TERAL I PREVE RENDE A VARI PROPI E) BEC	ENFOI NT TH R CON ANCE; ERTY (AUSE _	RCEMI E OWN FORM OR S DWNE	NER F ITY W TRICT R WIT	ROM U TTH SU COMF H NO I purpos	
8.	PRO great	PERTY R er than 20 erty line.	ATHER T	HAN To much on the narr	HE CIR of this pro ow width	CUMS	STANCI On thi	ES OF s half, 1	THE Al	PPLICATION OF THE PROPERTY OF	ANT Bl	ECAUS e. It's 1	SE <u>the</u>	
9.	PUR the se	POSE AN	CE WILL D INTEN property 1 nd the alte	T OF Tines. The	HE ZON	NING ed bui	ORDIN lding set	ANCE	E BECA are grea	USE	the c	hange	s come i	no closer to
A VAI	RIANO	CE MAY I	BE GRAN	TED IF	ALL TH	ESE (CONDI	ΓΙΟΝS	S ARE M	IET				
DECIS	ION:	THE RE	QUESTE1	O VARIA	ANCE IS	GRA	NTED.							
MOTIC	ON:	Weis		S	ECOND):	Hoeft		VOTE	2: 2-1 (voice v	ote)		
COND	ITIOI	NS OF AF	PROVAL:	As pres	sented at	hearir	ng which	has a	greater	setback	than th	ne origi	inal vari	ance.
SIGNE	ED:		C		ERSON				_DATE	E:	03-14	1-2019		

BOARD DECISIONS MAY BE APPEALED TO CIRCUIT COURT. AUDIO RECORD OF THESE PROCEEDINGS IS AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST.

DECISION OF THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT JEFFERSON COUNTY, WISCONSIN

PETITION NO.: HEARING DATE:	2019 V1642 03-14-2019	- - -
APPLICANT:	Doral Richardson	
PROPERTY OWNER:	Doral & Linda Richa	rdson
PARCEL (PIN) #:	018-0713-0414-001	(W8511 Airport Rd)
TOWNSHIP:	Lake Mills	
INTENT OF PETITION from the property line at W		an accessory structure at less than the required setback 118-0713-0414-001.
THE APPLICANT REQUIRE JEFFERSON COULT		
THE GRANT OR DENIA	AL OF THE VARIANO	TRUCTION AND PROPERTY WHICH RELATE TO CE APPLICATION ARE:
-Currently zoned A	,	w feet from the ROW – Sections 11.04 (f)(6) and 11.07(d)
require 50' from ro		wheel nome the weather than the first the firs
		structure would meet the setbacks
		d proposed structure (see map)
	eld located directly sout	
-what is the exact (distance from proposed	building to ROW?
	ONS BASED ON SITE	E INSPECTIONS: Site inspections ocation.
FACTS PRESENTED AT	' PUBLIC HEARING:	See tape, minutes & file.
A NO VADIANCE MAY		ON STANDARDS I WOULD HAVE THE EFFECT OF ALLOWING A USE OF
		DLATE STATE LAWS OR ADMINISTRATIVE RULES:

- B. SUBJECT TO THE ABOVE LIMITATIONS, AREA VARIANCES MAY BE GRANTED WHERE STRICT COMPLIANCE WITH THE ZONING ORDINANCE RESULTS IN AN UNNECESSARY HARDSHIP WHICH WOULD UNREASONABLY PREVENT THE PETITIONER FROM USING THE PROPERTY FOR A PERMITTED PURPOSE, OR WOULD RENDER CONFORMITY WITH THE ZONING ORDINANCE UNNECESSARILY BURDENSOME, AND WILL ALLOW THE SPIRIT OF THE ORDINANCE TO BE OBSERVED, SUBSTANTIAL JUSTICE TO BE ACCOMPLISHED, AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST NOT VIOLATED.
- C. SUBJECT TO THE ABOVE LIMITATIONS, USE VARIANCES MAY BE GRANTED WHERE STRICT COMPLIANCE WITH THE ZONING ORDINANCE WOULD LEAVE THE PROPERTY OWNER WITH NO REASONABLE USE OF THE PROPERTY IN THE ABSENCE OF A VARIANCE AND WILL ALLOW THE SPIRIT OF THE ORDINANCE TO BE OBSERVED, SUBSTANTIAL JUSTICE TO BE ACCOMPLISHED, AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST NOT VIOLATED.

BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT, THE BOARD CONCLUDES THAT:

- 10. UNNECESSARY HARDSHIP IS NOT PRESENT IN THAT A LITERAL ENFORCEMENT OF THE TERMS OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE WOULD NOT UNREASONABLY PREVENT THE OWNER FROM USING THE PROPERTY FOR A PERMITTED PURPOSE OR WOULD RENDER CONFORMITY WITH SUCH RESTRICTIONS UNNECESSARILY BURDENSOME (AREA VARIANCE) OR STRICT COMPLIANCE WITH THE ZONING ORDINANCE WOULD LEAVE THE PROPERTY OWNER WITH NO REASONABLE USE OF THE PROPERTY (USE VARIANCE) BECAUSE there are alternatives so there is no hardship. Alternatives include vacation of ROW, removal/replacement of milk house as well as being placed along the house. There are many other places this could go. Their chosen spot is too close to the lot line.
- 11. THE HARDSHIP OR NO REASONABLE USE IS NOT DUE TO UNIQUE PHYSICAL LIMITATIONS OF THE PROPERTY RATHER THAN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE APPLICANT BECAUSE ______ there are alternatives, so there is no hardship. There are no physical limitations. The well & septic are behind the house. There are plenty of other places this building could go.
- 12. THE VARIANCE WILL NOT BE CONTRARY TO THE PUBLIC INTEREST AS EXPRESSED BY THE PURPOSE AND INTENT OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE BECAUSE it's all on his property and it meets ordinance specifications for usage.

A VARIANCE MAY BE GRANTED IF ALL THESE CONDITIONS ARE MET

DECISION: THE REQUESTED VARIANCE IS **DENIED**.

MOTION: Roberts SECOND: Hoeft VOTE: 3-0 (voice vote)

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL/DENIAL:

SIGNED:		DATE:	03-14-2019
	CHAIRPERSON		

BOARD DECISIONS MAY BE APPEALED TO CIRCUIT COURT. AUDIO RECORD OF THESE PROCEEDINGS IS AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST.

DECISION OF THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT JEFFERSON COUNTY, WISCONSIN

PETITION NO.: HEARING DATE:	2019 V1643 03-14-2019
APPLICANT:	Nancy May Bishell
PROPERTY OWNER:_	SAME
PARCEL (PIN) #:	022-0613-0533-012, -013, -022 (W9304/W9308 Oakland Rd)
TOWNSHIP:	Oakland
structure at W9304 & W93	NER:To allow for the variance of the rear/side set back of a detached 08 Oakland Rd, PIN 022-0613-0533-012& 0533-013 and for a variance to create a .) below the minimum lot size at W9308 Oakland Rd, PIN 022-0613-0533-013.
-	UESTS A VARIANCE FROM SECTION <u>11.04(f)(1)</u> OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE.
THE GRANT OR DENI	HE PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION AND PROPERTY WHICH RELATE TO AL OF THE VARIANCE APPLICATION ARE: coned R-1 (0.16ac) & (0.29ac)
•	d was vacated May 2018
	would like to divide parcels
	lot size = 10,000 sq. ft. (80' x 80') – Section 11.04(f)(1)
	lines and structures must meet setbacks
-Proposed 1	ot 1 will be less than the required area; proposing 8,628 sq. ft. and does not have
an 80' x 80'	
-Required s	etback for detached garage would be 3 ft; proposing 2.8 ft.
	ot 2 meets 10,000 sq. ft. area but not the 80' x 80'; proposing 68.47' x 62.49'
	ONS BASED ON SITE INSPECTIONS: Site inspections ved property layout & location.
FACTS PRESENTED A	Γ PUBLIC HEARING: See tape, minutes & file.
	DECISION STANDARDS
	Y BE GRANTED WHICH WOULD HAVE THE EFFECT OF ALLOWING A USE OF TY WHICH WOULD VIOLATE STATE LAWS OR ADMINISTRATIVE RULES:

- B. SUBJECT TO THE ABOVE LIMITATIONS, AREA VARIANCES MAY BE GRANTED WHERE STRICT COMPLIANCE WITH THE ZONING ORDINANCE RESULTS IN AN UNNECESSARY HARDSHIP WHICH WOULD UNREASONABLY PREVENT THE PETITIONER FROM USING THE PROPERTY FOR A PERMITTED PURPOSE, OR WOULD RENDER CONFORMITY WITH THE ZONING ORDINANCE UNNECESSARILY BURDENSOME, AND WILL ALLOW THE SPIRIT OF THE ORDINANCE TO BE OBSERVED, SUBSTANTIAL JUSTICE TO BE ACCOMPLISHED, AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST NOT VIOLATED.
- C. SUBJECT TO THE ABOVE LIMITATIONS, USE VARIANCES MAY BE GRANTED WHERE STRICT COMPLIANCE WITH THE ZONING ORDINANCE WOULD LEAVE THE PROPERTY OWNER WITH NO REASONABLE USE OF THE PROPERTY IN THE ABSENCE OF A VARIANCE AND WILL ALLOW THE SPIRIT OF THE ORDINANCE TO BE OBSERVED, SUBSTANTIAL JUSTICE TO BE ACCOMPLISHED, AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST NOT VIOLATED.

BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT, THE BOARD CONCLUDES THAT:

- 13. UNNECESSARY HARDSHIP IS PRESENT IN THAT A LITERAL ENFORCEMENT OF THE TERMS OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE WOULD UNREASONABLY PREVENT THE OWNER FROM USING THE PROPERTY FOR A PERMITTED PURPOSE OR WOULD RENDER CONFORMITY WITH SUCH RESTRICTIONS UNNECESSARILY BURDENSOME (AREA VARIANCE) OR STRICT COMPLIANCE WITH THE ZONING ORDINANCE WOULD LEAVE THE PROPERTY OWNER WITH NO REASONABLE USE OF THE PROPERTY (USE VARIANCE) BECAUSE _______ it is an unnecessary hardship to have two houses on one lot. The garage setback would require removal or relocation. It's a hardship to have two houses on one lot which is prohibited by county ordinance. Hoeft objected the property is currently being used for a permitted purpose.
- 14. THE HARDSHIP OR NO REASONABLE USE IS DUE TO UNIQUE PHYSICAL LIMITATIONS OF THE PROPERTY RATHER THAN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE APPLICANT BECAUSE <u>it's at 19,750</u> square feet total lot size, and the garages are 5' apart. The structures, in the platting of the lots, existed before the Ordinance. This is also despite the fact that there was ROW abandonment. Hoeft objected cannot be content with creating a substandard lot.
- 15. THE VARIANCE WILL NOT BE CONTRARY TO THE PUBLIC INTEREST AS EXPRESSED BY THE PURPOSE AND INTENT OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE BECAUSE it will not be contrary. The situation presented is very close to the County Ordinance. Three substandard lots were turned into one conforming lot and one non-conforming lot.

A VARIANCE MAY BE GRANTED IF ALL THESE CONDITIONS ARE MET

	THE REQUESTEI			<u> </u>		
MOTION:	Roberts	SECOND:	Weis	VOTE: 2-1	(voice vote)	
CONDITION	NS OF APPROVAL/	DENIAL:				
SIGNED:				DATE:	03-14-2019	
	С	HAIRPERSON				

BOARD DECISIONS MAY BE APPEALED TO CIRCUIT COURT. AUDIO RECORD OF THESE PROCEEDINGS IS AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST.